

## **REMARKS**

Claims 61, 63-67 and 69-71 remain pending in the present application. Claims 62 and 68 have been cancelled. Claims 61, 65, 66 and 71 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 61, 63, 66, 67 and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Osakabe, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,713,413). Claim 62 and Claim 68 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 62 depended from Claim 61. Claim 61 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 62 and Claim 62 has been cancelled. Thus, Applicant believes Claim 61, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claim 63, which depends from Claim 61, is also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 68 depended from Claim 66. Claim 66 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 68 and Claim 68 has been cancelled. Thus, Applicant believes Claim 66, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 67 and 69, which depend from Claim 66, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 64 and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osakabe, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,713,413) in view of Osakabe, et al. (JP 10050909). Claim 64 depends from Claim 63 which depends from Claim 61. Claim 70 depends from Claim 69 which depends from Claim 66. As detailed above, Claims 61 and 66 have been amended and are now believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Thus, Claims 64 and 70 are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

Claims 62, 65, 68 and 71 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 62 has been cancelled and its limitations incorporated into Claim 61 as discussed above.

Claim 65 depended from Claim 63 which depended from Claim 61. Claim 65 has been amended to independent form to include the limitations of Claims 61 and 63 and is thus believed to be allowable.

Claim 68 has been cancelled and its limitations incorporated into Claim 66 as discussed above.

Claim 71 depended from Claim 69 which depended from Claim 66. Claim 71 has been amended to independent form to include the limitations of Claims 66 and 69 and is thus believed to be allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

Dated: October 4, 2004

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg